

REMARKS

Responsive to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute the claims of Group III (Claims 6-28), drawn to a method of treating or preventing a thrombotic disorder. This election is being traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants further provisionally elect the species identified by the Examiner as Species A, drawn to an anti-tumor necrosis factor antibody. Generic Claims 6-7 and species Claims 8-15 are readable thereon.

The Examiner states that restriction is proper in the subjection application because (1) the invention of Group I, II, III and IV are distinct as shown by the different method objectives, method steps and parameters and reagents used; (2) the inventions of each group have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by "the different classification and recognized divergent subject matter"; and (3) the searches required for the different groups are not co-extensive. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The inventions of Groups I, II, III and IV are related in that the disease states are all associated with disorders relating to the circulatory system. The underlying mechanisms for the inventions are overlapping. It is known, for example, that fibrinogen and platelets play integral roles in the formation of blood clots and that elevated circulating fibrinogen and platelet levels are associated with increased risk of developing a blood clotting disorder. Indeed, the invention of Group III (treating or preventing thrombotic disorders) includes embodiments which would also be embraced by the inventions of Groups I, II and IV. As such, restriction is improper.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the examination of Groups I, II, III and IV together would not place an undue burden upon the Examiner. The domestic and international classification for each invention is the same (class 424, subclass 130.1). A

search of the prior art for the methods defined in one group would also identify prior art that is applicable to the other groups. Furthermore, in light of the close and, at times, overlapping relationship of these inventions, a complete search of one invention would necessarily entail a search of the remaining inventions. For example, a search of the prior art for methods of treating or preventing a thrombotic disorder by administering a tumor necrosis factor antagonist (Group III) would necessarily identify prior art that is applicable to Group I, II and IV.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

If the grounds of traversal do not result in withdrawal of the restriction requirement, Applicants reserve the right to file a divisional application or take such other appropriate action as deemed necessary to protect the inventions of Group I (Claims 1-3), II (Claims 4-5) and IV (Claims 29-50). Applicants do not hereby abandon or waive any rights in the inventions of the non-elected groups.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen Lee

Helen Lee
Registration No. 39,270
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone: (617) 861-6240

Lexington, MA 02173

Dated:

December 17, 1996